

### REMARKS

The present application was filed on October 31, 2003 with claims 1-20. Claims 1-20 were pending prior to the amendments made herein, with claims 1, 19 and 20 being the pending independent claims.

The drawings are objected to as being informal.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0049564 (hereinafter “Ng”).

In this response, Applicants traverse the objection to the drawings, cancel claims 17-19, and amend claims 1-16 and 20. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments above and the remarks to follow.

With regard to the objection to the drawings, Applicants filed formal drawings in the present application on November 21, 2003. Applicants received a return postcard bearing an indication from the USPTO that the formal drawings were received in the USPTO on November 24, 2003. Applicants have attached hereto copies of the formal drawing transmittal, the formal drawings, and the return postcard. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

With regard to the §102(e) rejection, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to clarify that the claim is directed to a network processor integrated circuit. Thus, the recited processor clients, internal memory instances and internal memory controller are all elements of the single recited network processor integrated circuit. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification. See, for example, FIGS. 1 and 2 and the associated text at page 5, lines 7-26, and FIG. 5 and the associated text at page 3, lines 26-27. With reference to FIG. 2 it can be seen that, in an illustrative embodiment of the invention, processor clients 120, memory instances 122 and memory controller 115 are all internal to the network processor 102, which is disclosed as being implemented as an integrated circuit.

In formulating the §102(e) rejection, the Examiner relies primarily on the arrangement shown in FIG. 2 of Ng and the corresponding text in paragraphs [0037] through [0039]. However, this figure shows a storage area network (SAN) that connects multiple server devices 202 with multiple storage devices 230-238. It is clear from, for example, paragraph [0001] of Ng that a given SAN and its associated server devices and

storage devices are not elements of a network processor integrated circuit as recited in the independent claims.


Although individual elements of the FIG. 2 arrangement in Ng may indeed comprise integrated circuits, what is set forth in claim 1 as amended is a network processor integrated circuit that itself includes as internal elements the recited processor clients, memory instances and internal memory controller. These recited elements are all within the network processor integrated circuit. Clearly Ng fails to teach or suggest a network processor integrated circuit of this type.

A similar amendment has been made to independent claim 20.

Applicants have amended dependent claims 2-15 to maintain consistency with independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-16 and 20 as amended herein are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joseph B. Ryan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Joseph" and last name "Ryan" clearly distinguishable.

Date: March 27, 2008

Joseph B. Ryan  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 37,922  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
90 Forest Avenue  
Locust Valley, NY 11560  
(516) 759-7517

Enclosure(s): Copy of November 21, 2003 Transmittal of Formal Drawings  
Copy of Formal Drawings filed November 21, 2003  
Copy of Return Postcard from USPTO